

Approved as revised

Zoning Board of Appeals

City Hall Auditorium

62 Friend Street

Amesbury, MA 01913

SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

7:05 p.m. Call to order.

Present: Matt Sherrill, William Lavoie, Donna Collins, David Haraske, Bob Orem

Absent: Matt Vincent, Sharon McDermot, and Denis Nadeau, Building Inspector.

Also present: Susan Yeames, Recording Secretary. Minutes transcribed by Paul Bibaud.

Minutes:

Minutes of 7-23-15: Motion to approve by Bob Orem, seconded by William Lavoie. AIF.

Minutes of 8-27-15: Motion to approve by Donna Collins, seconded by David Haraske.

AIF.

Request to Extend the Comprehensive Permit - 131 Haverhill road – Attitash Views LLC

Paul Crochiere, representing Attitash Views: We are here to get a (1) year extension of the date by which construction has to start on the Attitash Views project, Haverhill Road. There is a long permitting history on this project. The current status is that the comprehensive permit had been granted after various appeals, and is in effect. The deadline right now to commence construction is February 14, 2016. That deadline had been extended a couple years ago for 3 years. The board said to extend it for 2 years and we'll see what happens at that point.

This past summer, the applicant had entered into agreement to sell the project to John Gorman LLC. He's developed locally and has a project he's done on river view heights off of Pleasant Valley road. Mr. Gorman has to do some permitting work with Concom and get state authority to be the successor developer of this project. Those will take some time, and his concern is that once those things happen, it'll be winter, and the February start date may not be feasible given weather conditions, etc. So we're respectfully requesting that the board extend the start date for construction to be February 14, 2017 instead of February 14, 2016. This would be within the board's jurisdiction and only constitute a minor change.

Matt Sherrill: I had a little bit of trouble with some of the dates. They didn't seem to quite coincide with what we're voting on. It says "this date initially was February 14, 2014. On or about May 24, 2013, you were looking for a (3) year extension. We gave you a (2) year extension. Would that have gone from February 14, 2014 to February 14, 2016? So by modification #1, dated June 26, 2013, the board extended construction for (2) years to the February 14, 2016 date. So right now, you're just asking for an extension because currently, it doesn't run out until February 14, 2016. Normally, applicants come before us in January for a February extension date. Can you prove that, if we grant this extension, that you still have site control?

Paul Crochiere: Yes. We will send you a letter that we still have control of the site, along with a copy of the deed.

Close and discuss.

We have a request for a one year extension for this application by the name of Attitash Views, to extend construction date from February 14, 2016 to February 14, 2017.

Approved as revised

Bill Lavoie: Yes.

Bob Orem: Yes

Donna Collins: Yes.

Matt Sherrill: Yes.

David Haraske: Yes. One year extension approved.

23R Chester Street - Continuance for a Variance seeking pre-existing lot with insufficient frontage and width to enable a single family home to be constructed thereon.

Applicant is Emily Smedstad.

Matt Sherrill: The board was asking for was an opinion from the Amesbury Fire Department just saying if they felt as though that property was safe enough to build on, as far as the fire dept. Was concerned. We did get a letter from Amesbury fire and rescue addressed to ZBA “after review of the plans submitted for 23R Chester Street, the determination has been made that the structure to be built will require an NFPA 13D residential sprinkler system. This determination is based on ma. Comprehensive fire code 527cmr 10.chapter 18.2.3 and they have enclosed that with this letter. The fire dept has no further concerns with this property once a residential sprinkler system is installed. We suggest that ZBA that a deed restriction be required when the structure is built for an NFPA 13D sprinkler system to be installed and it is signed by Deputy James Nolan. Any further discussion by the board? None.

Close and vote:

Bill Lavoie: Yes

Bob Orem: Yes.

Donna Collins: Yes.

Matt Sherrill: Yes.

David Haraske: Yes.

Application is approved. Allow a 20 day appeal period. After that a building permit may be obtained.

Meadowbrook Estates – Extension of a Comprehensive Permit.

Matt Sherrill: they are a holder of a comprehensive permit for a 268 unit development off of Kimball Road and are requesting an extension of the comprehensive permit for the project known as Meadowbrook Estates. We had a meeting on Sept. 2, 2015 and decided to hold off on granting that extension because we felt that things were changing with the amount of units and ownership, that it would be only fair to hold this request for extension for that permit in a public hearing. That is why we continued this until tonight.

Peter Caruso, Attorney representing Meadowbrook Estates.

This 40B also has an extensive history. I first came to the board in 1996. In 2003, we filed an extension and was denied, appealed, denied, appealed, appealed, and finally in 2010 we got a 40B in the courts. Unfortunately, in that year, the owner of the property Wayne Vynorius fell very ill and died. That caused the project to be on hold. Since that time, I’d met with the town. This was 268 townhouse units. Since that time, in the past year, I met with the town and are seeking an extension of this permit because we’re seeking to reduce the number of units from 268 to around 150 or 155, a substantial reduction. That caused several plans to be re-applied and run by several boards. We feel this would be much better for the area. In talks with the town and the Vynorius family, we felt an extension would be in wise so we can reduce the

Approved as revised

number of units from 268 to 150 or so. We'll also continue discussing with the town, and may consider going from a condominium style 40B, which was approved, to possibly some single family homes. We request an extension, then return in one year to assess how the project is going.

Matt Sherrill: So, if we grant this (1) year extension to September 30, 2016, basically we'd be granting the extension to the permit as it is today, 268 units. Nothing on that plan can change, between now and 2016. That is the extension they are asking for. They are not asking us to approve an extension for a modified permit or anything like that. If this application is substantially modified, and it sounds like it probably will, the applicant has to come before ZBA and re-apply, going through the whole process again. So they are asking us to extend that permit for (1) more year to September 30, 2016 so they can get their ducks in a row and move forward with a much different plan.

Two abutters wishing to speak:

Stephanie Bryant, 2 Birch Meadow Road, along with my neighbor, Russell Leblanc:

Where is the road leading into this development?

Matt Sherrill: It already exists, taking a left before you get to the state line store. It won't affect Birch Meadow Road. When this applicant was in front of us, they tried to convince this board that they owned property to be able to have an emergency access out onto Birchmeadow Road. We disagreed and the court ultimately found in favor of the applicant. I don't know where this stands, that stuff may now be off the table. But the entrance to this project is off of Kimball Road.

Linda Perreault, 45 Birch Meadow Road: Can you explain again the second egress that will be offered for this project?

Matt Sherrill: I honestly do not know if they are going to use the second egress, but when the applicant was in front of us, they tried to convince this board that they owned land from the project out through a roadway, dirt road way, that came out onto birch meadow road. The applicant said that it would only be used for an emergency access road for a second means of access for the fire dept. But we weren't entirely convinced that they actually owned the land. But the application was sent through all of the channels and made it to the Supreme Court who found in favor of the applicant, allowing them to build that project as it was presented to us. If there is any change, they have to come back before ZBA. If it's a substantial change, the applicant has to start from scratch and re-present everything to us by a public hearing.

Jack Sanborn, off Birchmeadow on 4 Birch Lane: I travel the road every day along with over 80 homes. It's a one lane road, and I can't picture much more traffic on that road. It's not safe, even as it is now. No sidewalks, and seven 90 degree blind angle turns. I cannot see any more traffic on this road. It is a disaster and I am very concerned about this road.

Matt Sherrill: Those were some of our board's concerns at the time, as well. I also remember it was supposed to be a gated road.

Karen Hoffler, 95 Lone Goose Road, South Hampton: My bigger concern is this gentleman is asking for a (1) year extension of the existing plans of 268 units. This is on septic designs that were done 13 years ago? I think that needs to be looked at again. The board should take that into consideration too.

Matt Sherrill: I want everyone in the audience to remember, this board did not vote to pass that application. We fought it as far as we could. The courts decided that the applicant had the right to build this project, not the ZBA.

Jeff Holbrook, owner of property on Birchmeadow: So what you're saying is, right now, they have permission for the 268 units ?

Matt Sherrill: And there's nothing anybody can do about it.

Approved as revised

We have John Witten in the audience and he represented the city in the courts. Maybe he can shed light on this for us?

John Witten, Lawyer for City of Amesbury.

John Witten, Attorney: We represented the city in this matter. The court ruled that the comprehensive permit had to be granted. The board complied with that. But there is no assurance to the applicant that they would be able to get approval from DEP for the waste water treatment plans or that they'd be able to get approval from the commonwealth in terms of their requirements of the environmental policy act. So the board is not obligated to grant anything other than the comprehensive permit. The applicant has to obtain permits from other state and maybe federal and local agencies. So the comprehensive permit, even though the city lost in appeals court, doesn't mean the project can be built. That is why counsel is here before the board tonight, saying this project might be dead on arrival, I'm going to try plan B, which is very common with 40B projects. So a lot of the litigation is the municipality loss, but the projects never get built, and Amesbury is a perfect case of that. You have 3 comprehensive permits before you tonight, none of which have been built, and there are a lot of reasons for that. In this case, while the board must issue that comprehensive permit for the 268, the board is under no obligation to do anything else to assist this project. Re: the road access: the court didn't delve into the title. It would still be up to the applicant to demonstrate title and access rights over all the roads they sought to seek or use as egress. So the court reviewed it at a very superficial level under the comprehensive permit statute. The applicant has no more rights than anyone else under comprehensive permit. That's why they are here before you. If the board were to deny this request, then the applicant would either appeal your decision, or the comprehensive permit would simply lapse, and the applicant would have to come back before the ZBA with a new application and start from the beginning.

Pam Shaw, 12 Birch Lane: If you grant the request for a (3) year extension, does that mean that they can't do anything for the next 3 years?

Matt Sherrill: No. We're not even entertaining a (3) year extension, only a (1) year extension.

Bob Reneau, 18 Birchmeadow Road: I support what Jack Sanborn said about the access. Also, please explain 40B?

Matt Sherrill: It's for affordable housing, the project has to contain 25% deemed affordable housing. So they have to be mix in these units, they can't be separated, they must be part of the project sprinkled in. The state has said that at least 10 % of housing in every community has to be deemed affordable. To date, Amesbury is not at 10 %. That is why these 40B projects can come in front of us. These work towards the 10 % that we are hoping to attain.

Peter Caruso, Attorney: In 1996, we asked for 14 houses. They sent us away. The town said 14 houses is too little for this area. Come back with more houses. We came back with 46 houses. PLB said that was too many. So I've been working with Mr. Cammett since 1996. Then in 2001, we saw 40B come into play, and was a hot item back in 2001, so we said fine, we have 155 acres and they don't want 14 houses or 46 houses, so now, we're up to 268 units. So we're down \$3 million in fees, and in a bind. We got 268 approved, have talked to the town for the past year, now we're talking about 155 units, mainly to recoup our money. We also offered to give this 155 acres to the town...free. All we asked for was to remove the gravel, that we'd replenish that with lawns, playing fields, or whatever the town wanted. The town said no. That was in 1999. Their ulterior motive was, they just wanted the thing. It has been a horrible fight over this whole time. This request is for a two pronged extension. We're only here for the extension. We have to come back and explain exactly what we're going to do, in detail. We want the extension to have time to create a new plan. One, to get the extension, and 2. we have to come back before you to tell you exactly what we plan to do. But we can't hire Woody Cammett again until we get the extension, so the new plans can get done.

Approved as revised

Linda Perreault, 45 Birchmeadow Road: A lot of the trees were removed from all that property back there. I abutt that property. A lot of gravel was removed, and there were no permits that were pulled. They were supposed to fill it up, and...

Matt Sherrill: That has no relevance to this project. That happened before this project was presented. If you have a question re: the relevance of this 40B project in front of us, I will entertain the question. I'm trying to keep out of the history lesson.

42 Birchmeadow (no name given, heavy accent): If affordable housing is granted, can there be a bus route to serve them?

Matt Sherrill: I don't think that has anything to do with what we vote on.

Charles Wright, 55 Birchmeadow: Brookside Lane is emergency access for emergency vehicles.

Andy Olsen, 46 Birchmeadow Road: My understanding is that the land was broken up into different pieces. So if it is in different pieces, how does it get divided up if it is in different pieces?

Matt Sherrill: I don't know anything about that, all I know is we are here tonight to vote on an extension for a comprehensive permit that was in front of us before that the court system approved. All we're doing is extending that permit for one year. That's all we're doing.

Andy Olsen: Same number of acreage as before?

Matt Sherrill: It has to be. The plan has to be exactly as it was presented to us originally. That's the plan that was approved, it cannot change.

Andy Olsen: Why are we having this discussion if they are definitely going to be changing the plans and have to come back?

Matt Sherrill: Because they need the (1) year extension to be able to get their paperwork in order, possibly re-define this plan, etc. The current permit right now expires 9-30-15. They seek an extension of that permit to 9-30-16.

Anthony Fusco, 4 Brookside Lane: If extension is granted, they can go forward? We had questions about traffic pattern on Kimball Road, that doesn't have sidewalks. Also septic disposal questions. If you grant the extension, it seems like it still gives them the ability to go forward in attempting that. Two questions: 1. Do they have the ability to sell the property with the extended permit for the year?

John Witten: (inaudible speech from his auditorium seat).

Anthony Fusco: Second question: Instead of the board approving this, is there any way we can put it to a town vote of some type? It seems like we have the option to put them into an appeal process.

Matt Sherrill: I don't know what to tell you, but if you think that this board flew this project through and approved it with flying colors, you are dead wrong. Also, the permits are transferrable during the extension.

Denis Nadeau: The court says we need a major reason to stop this project. Close and vote to extend for one year:

William Lavoie: Yes.

Bob Orem: Yes.

Donna Collins: Yes

Matt Sherrill: Yes.

David Haraske: Yes.

A (1) one year extension has been granted.

5 minute recess, then re-open the hearing after the room clears.

Approved as revised

91 Whitehall Road – A Finding Permit Application

Alan and Kathryn Gilbert: Seeking expansion of deck and second floor. Sitting on the case are Bill, Bob, Donna, Matt S. and Dave.

Woody Cammett, representative: Renovate current house, second story, and greenhouse will be demolished. Become a dining room and second greenhouse will be demolished and a deck constructed. Foot print doesn't change. No impact on neighborhood. So we propose to build within the footprint that is currently there, the lot is non-conforming in setbacks and frontage, and we'll go straight up with a second story that will result in a height differential of approximately 7 ½ feet. Approved by the Conservation Commission without stipulations.

David Haraske: Two retaining walls to be removed on the right side of the property, as there is no reason for them. Will be 7 feet higher than existed and a full foundation to be put in. structure meets all requirements.

No further questions.

Kathleen Berman, 87 Whitehall Road: I am looking forward to changes.

Close and discuss:

1. Predates zoning, yes. 1955.
2. Area, frontage, front, sides and rear setbacks = nonconforming.
3. No change.
4. No new conformity issues.
- 5.

Close and vote:

William Lavoie: Yes.

Bob Orem: Yes.

Donna Collins: Yes.

Matt Sherrill: Yes.

David Haraske: yes.

Application approved.

355 Main Street - Seeking a Finding Permit - (Gayle Welch)

Reconstruction of an existing garage. All set on application.

Sitting on this: Bill Lavoie, Bob Orem, Donna Collins, Matt Sherrill, and Dave Haraske.

Woody Cammett, Cammett Engineering: Old house on Main Street. Garage on left side that is decrepit running along with retaining wall that extends into the flood plain in the rear. Wants to replace and will move it forward and enlarge it, moving it out of the flood plain. Roof structure will be brought to current code, enlarge the garage. The roof doesn't meet any code whatsoever, to become only 2 feet higher than existing. Windows in rear. Will meet setback criteria. Will lose one window in kitchen. Creates no new non-conformity. Meets all criteria for a finding. No questions. Will remove a dying tree and will replace with two on another part of property.

Close and discuss: (Bob Orem / Donna Collins)

Predates zoning (1855).

Area, front, left side and rear setbacks.

No change or less.

Approved as revised
Moving it out of flood plain
No new non-conformity.

Close and vote: (Donna Collins / Bob Orem)

William Lavoie: Yes.

Bob Orem: Yes.

Donna Collins: Yes.

Matt Sherrill: Yes.

David Haraske: Yes.

Application was approved.

29 Clarks Road, Eagle Point - 56 Rental Unit Project - submitted A Notice of Project Change (ROGER LEBLANC - NOTICE OF PROJECT CHANGE. CHANGE IS SUBSTANTIAL.)

JOHN WITTEN, ATTORNEY: The applicant is not here. I think the board is in receipt of a request from Attorney Freeman for an extension of the comprehensive permit. So, I'm comfortable addressing the request made for modification, but I think the board should also vote on the extension as well. For background, the board did vote to declare the request for modification to be a substantial change, you notified the applicant that it would be discussed tonight at this public hearing. In the interim, the applicant appealed your decision to the housing appeals court, which is within his right to do so but it's quite unusual because that appeal was claiming you should not have declared it a substantial change. That appeal is going to be heard at a very initial level called the conference of counsel on October 1, after tonight's meeting, where you would have addressed the substantial change. So the applicant has taken an appeal, and that appeal is now going to play out at the process of the housing and appeals committee. So my advice to the board would be to make a decision on the request for an extension, with the understanding that should you grant that extension, you are not waiving any of your rights given the appeal that the applicant is taking to the housing and appeals committee. Because the applicant took an appeal to the housing and appeals committee, it is my advice to the board not to address the changes that he has proposed because the housing and appeals committee is going to assume jurisdiction. When I am with the housing and appeals committee on October 1st, I am going to tell the committee that they have to remand it back to you, because you get to review this first, not them. So the applicant has put forward once again in this position, and the applicant is going to potentially drag this process out because of his own appeal. This hearing would have been able to settle it tonight. Instead, we're at the housing and appeals committee at a very initial stage on October 1st.

Matt Sherrill: I think they were also asking us to waive our waiver from Article 40, Building Demolition and Bylaw. That also came in. Is that something we should address?

Attorney Witten: On the waiver, my advice to the board would be to deny the request, because that is a substantive change to your permit, or if the applicant was here, I would not have asked the board to ask him for an extension. But without the applicant being here, I don't know how the board could entertain a substantive request for a waiver. On the extension, consistent with your prior conditions, the board might want to grant the one year extension. There is no reason not to. If you don't grant the extension, the housing and appeals committee is going to, so at least you'd have some control over the length of time.

Approved as revised

Donna Collins: Are they allowed to request an extension two days ahead of the meeting and expect us to vote on it?

Attorney Witten: The whole posture is wrong on many levels, most notably appealing a decision by you that it is a substantial change. Because all that would have required is exactly what is happening tonight, a public hearing, and then the applicant and his counsel is not even here. That is my advice, to vote on the extension, vote on the request on the demolition delay bylaw ordinance, and then continue the public hearing in this matter maybe three months out, until the process either gets remanded back to you or not. It's hard to say what will happen with that.

Matt Sherrill: When you said "vote on the waiver, we're going to take no action"?

Attorney Witten: My advice is either to deny or continue it as part of the public hearing. The problem is, they have made that request, it is hard to say, is that part of the public hearing process, or is that part of the extension of time? And they are not here to explain themselves. So I think the safer course of action is to deny that request, if the board so chooses, grant the extension, and then the rest will get sorted out at the housing and appeals committee.

Denis Nadeau, Building Inspector and ZBA Agent: I don't ever remember that coming up, requesting us to waive that bylaw. I don't think it can be waived. It would have to a variance, because that's part of the zoning bylaw, it is not just the bylaw.

Attorney Witten: The board can grant waivers to general bylaws, but your point is a good one, the tests for granting waivers is the ordinance renders the project uneconomic. The applicant has to provide you with some level of proof that that waiver is needed to keep the project from being uneconomic, and there is nothing in what Attorney Freeman submitted that gives you any indication, other than they want the waiver.

Board is comfortable and has no questions for Attorney Witten tonight.

MATT SHERRILL: TWO THINGS TO DISCUSS:

1. REQUEST FOR A WAIVER FROM ARTICLE 40 BUILDING DEMOLITION BYLAW THAT HAS BEEN BROUGHT BEFORE US.
2. 1 YEAR EXTENSION.

TRACI CHALIFOUR, 25 CLARKS ROAD, #201 - ABUTTER

On behalf of the half the people in the room who weren't abutters at the time, is it possible to get a nut shell synopsis on what exactly he's trying to change, and why he is asking for a waiver of the demolition bylaw? Out of respect for your time, I don't want to keep everybody here late, but I think since they made an effort to come here tonight, could we get a brief, or is it not brief?

Matt Sherrill: Again, Attorney Witten has been hand in hand with this project all the way through the court systems. He may be able to give you a quick snapshot of what was presented, how the process went, and what's in front of us right now. He can also speak to the request for the waiver from the building demolition bylaw. It's my understanding that the house that is there now (red house), as part of this project, he wants to take it down because it is either 100 years or more years old. In order to take down a structure of that age, it has to go in front of the Historical Commission and they can do what they want, such as putting a stay of execution on this thing, if you will, they can delay it up to two years if they determine that that building is of significant value. So I'm assuming that is why he is asking us to waive it. I certainly don't feel comfortable doing that. This just came in the other day.

Traci Chalifour: Because I couldn't find it in my paperwork either, that's why I'm asking. And because I'm an interested party, I get copied on everything. I didn't see anything. In order for me to figure out what he is trying to change, it's a laborious process.

Approved as revised

Matt Sherrill: That's why we have Attorney Witten to help us through this process.

Traci Chalifour: So could he give us a briefing to get us up to speed?

Matt Sherrill: Absolutely.

Attorney Jon Witten: So the ZBA issued a comprehensive permit, it was appealed to the housing and appeals committee, then appealed to Superior Court, then Superior Court's decision affirmed the housing and appeals committee's decision. Many of the board's original permit conditions were left intact by the housing and appeals committee, some were struck. What the applicant is seeking first from the board of appeals but now from the housing and appeals committee, is to modify that comprehensive permit. So there are innumerable requested revisions to that comprehensive permit. So deletions of conditions, deletions of requirements that the board imposed, claims that the requirements the ZBA imposed were inconsistent with state court decisions, HAC decisions, and the decision itself is 29 pages. There are a lot of revisions that the applicant has proposed. It is certainly public record, but rather than go through them, so what the applicant or his counsel have done is gone through the decision and identified in their minds what needs to be struck or modified. That is of course a substantial change, but more to the point, many of the conditions they are asking you to strike, now the housing /appeals committee to strike, in my opinion, would be that the ZBA has to weigh in on those, because the board does not automatically strike conditions just because the applicant wants them struck. So that was the original purpose of the public hearing. Because the applicant has appealed this to the housing and appeals committee, I see no reason for the board to waste any time or your time to go through those, which would be a false exercise, because the housing and appeals committee now has jurisdiction. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the applicant has chosen to do this. Generally, the applicant would appeal what comes out of tonight's hearing, if they are not satisfied with what you have done. But they haven't given you a chance to satisfy them or not satisfy them. So I'm happy to go through them, but it'd be a fruitless exercise, in the sense that this is now teed up at the housing and appeals committee for at least a couple sessions.

DENIS NADEAU: There are no plans showing all these changes. A lot of these are changes to units, changes to landscaping, the bridge, the wetlands crossing, and there's no plans for us to look at to show what they've changed? How can you determine anything if you don't have a set of plans?

ATTORNEY WITTEN: The number in the decision remains the same: 56 total, fourteen below market, plus the manager's unit. So what the request does is to cut conditions of the permit, but doesn't modify the total number of units. But as Denis said, we don't know whether there is an alteration of the footprints, or the layout, or storm drainage facilities

JOHN JANCIEWICZ, ABUTTER: I have 421 feet abutting on the Route 110 side of Roger's project. He was approved for 56 units...correct?

Matt Sherrill: As Attorney Witten, says, there are a lot of conditions that were in the application that they want modified, deleted, struck, and as a board, we felt that that was a significant change, please come before us at an open meeting and discuss those changes. Then at the end of that meeting, if we felt as though that that was still something that we could live with, then we'd make some sort of decision as to whether to move forward with the application. That isn't happening, he's not here, and he is appealing our last decision, so I think everyone here is in tune with what we need to do tonight.

EARL GREY, 27 ½ CLARKS ROAD, ABUTTER: Are you looking at just the appeal or are you talking about the extension also right now?

MATT SHERRILL: The only thing that we are really going to address tonight is their request for the extension for one year, to the date of January 14, 2017.

EARL GREY: It looks like they've already had up to three extensions already.

Approved as revised

MATT SHERRILL: Unfortunately, I think every single 40B project that has been in front of us, the ones we liked and the ones we haven't liked, have been in front of us for roughly 2, 3, and 4 extensions. All these projects, remember, were started back in the early 2000's. We have to have a really good solid reason why we say no to an extension. Otherwise, they just appeal our decision, we waste town money, and they end up right back in front of us again.

CLOSE AND DISCUSS:

Waiver for demolition bylaw

A "yes" vote indicates approval of the waiver

A "no" vote indicates denial of the waiver

VOTE:

Bill Lavoie: No

Bob Orem: No

Donna Collins: No

Matt Sherrill: No

David Haraske: No

Request for waiver from Demolition Bylaw is denied

Request for 1-year extension

A "yes" vote indicates approval of a 1 year extension.

A "no" vote indicated denial of a 1 year extension.

VOTE:

Bill Lavoie: Yes

Bob Orem: Yes

Donna Collins: Yes

Matt Sherrill: Yes

David Haraske: Yes

Approve one year extension to expire on January 14, 2017.

Public Hearing for Project Change

Vote to continue the public hearing for three months to 12-10-15:

Bill Lavoie: Yes.

Bob Orem: Yes.

Donna Collins: Yes.

Matt Sherrill: Yes.

David Haraske: Yes.

Public hearing will be continued to 12-10-15

**Motion to adjourn was made by Donna Collins and seconded by Bob Orem. AIF
Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.**